TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE Transcriber's Office

March 10, 2000 LB 1107

the money to reduce property taxes. But basically this is a property tax, a nonequalized property tax relief effort. Again, I would emphasize that I have no objection with the general proposal here, that you're saying that...or the state Legislature, as a matter of policy, is saying we don't want property tax support of schools to have to exceed a certain level and, as Senator Wickersham has pointed out, in view of rising valuations or whatever other matter. The question is, where do you set that percentage? And the reason for this amendment is that I think that 47 percent is a quite acceptable number. I, obviously, disagree with Senator Wickersham on that. It certainly is one that looks to me to be a lot more manageable financially than the lower number. So with that, I will continue to listen to the discussion. Thank you.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, thank you, Senator Janssen. I'd like to ask a couple questions of Senator Raikes, if I could.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Senator Raikes, will you respond?

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Senator Raikes, I guess it's...could you...I missed part of the debate. Could you give me some clear explanation why you want to amend this.

SENATOR RAIKES: Senator, there's one of the...the two main thrusts of this bill that I want to hang onto, and that is that we want to set a limit as to the amount of school finance that would be provided by local property tax efforts. I think it's a good idea to...to have that sort of a concept out there. The second thrust is to set that amount specifically at 45 percent. My concern with that is that there is a big financial impact by doing that. I think that the concept can be preserved by setting a number, such as 47 percent, which I propose in this amendment, which is...puts us at a lot less financial risk, in my opinion.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, I guess my problem and my rationale for opposing your amendment is that when you look at the states